arXiv:hep-ph/9704283v1 10 Apr 1997

EXPERIMENTAL LIMITS ON COMPLETE POSITIVITY FROM THE K-$\overline{\mathrm{K}}$ SYSTEM

F. Benatti
Dipartimento di Fisica Teorica, Università di Trieste
Strada Costiera 11, 34014 Trieste, Italy
and
Istituto Nazionale di Fisica Nucleare, Sezione di Trieste

R. Floreanini
Istituto Nazionale di Fisica Nucleare, Sezione di Trieste
Dipartimento di Fisica Teorica, Università di Trieste
Strada Costiera 11, 34014 Trieste, Italy

Abstract

Available data on measured observables allow deriving estimates for some of the phenomenological parameters that characterize the time-evolution and decay of the neutral kaon system based on the hypothesis of complete positivity. The present experimental uncertainties are still too large to permit a full test of complete positivity.

Completely positive evolution maps are the most natural tools for the description of the time evolution of open quantum dynamical systems.[1, 2] These systems can be modeled as being small subsystems in interaction with suitable large environments. The global evolution of the closed compound system is described by an unitary map, while the reduced dynamics of the subsystem usually develops dissipation and irreversibility.

Assuming a weak coupling between subsystem and environment, the reduced time-evolution is free from non-linear feedback or memory effects; moreover, it possesses very basic and fundamental properties, like forward in time composition (semigroup property), probability conservation and entropy increase.

On the states of the subsystem, conveniently described by density matrices, the reduced evolution is realized by a one-parameter (= time) family of maps, transforming density matrices into density matrices and with the additional important property of being completely positive.[3-6] This set of transformations forms a so-called dynamical semigroup.

Decay systems can be viewed as specific examples of open quantum systems and therefore dynamical semigroups can be effectively used in their description. Indeed, the time evolution of the neutral kaon system have been recently studied within this framework.[7, 8] In practice, assuming a complete positive map being at the basis of the dynamics of the kaons results in the addition to the standard Wiesskopf-Wigner evolution of an extra linear piece, characterized by six real phenomenological parameters. In the following we shall explain in detail how bounds on some of these parameters can be obtained from available experimental data.

As usual, we shall model the evolution and decay of the K^0-$\overline{K^0}$ system by means of a two-dimensional Hilbert space. [9] A convenient orthonormal basis in this space is given by the CP-eigenstates $|K_1\rangle$ and $|K_2\rangle$:

$$|K_1\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\Big[|K^0\rangle + |\overline{K^0}\rangle\Big]\ , \quad |K_2\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\Big[|K^0\rangle - |\overline{K^0}\rangle\Big]\ . \tag{1}$$

As already mentioned, states of a quantum system evolving in time can be suitably described by a density matrix ρ. This is a positive hermitian operator, *i.e.* with positive eigenvalues, and constant trace (for unitary evolutions). In the case of the kaon system, ρ is a two-dimensional matrix. With respect to the basis (1) it can be written as:

$$\rho = \begin{pmatrix} \rho_1 & \rho_3 \\ \rho_4 & \rho_2 \end{pmatrix}\ , \tag{2}$$

where $\rho_4 \equiv \rho_3^*$, and $*$ signifies complex conjugation.

The evolution in time of this matrix can be described in general by an equation of the following form:

$$\frac{\partial \rho(t)}{\partial t} = -iH\,\rho(t) + i\rho(t)\,H^\dagger + L[\rho]. \tag{3}$$

The first two pieces in the r.h.s. constitute the standard Weisskopf-Wigner contribution, while L is a linear map that is fully determined by the condition of complete positivity.

The effective hamiltonian H (the Weisskopf-Wigner hamiltonian) includes a nonhermitian part, that characterizes the natural width of the states:

$$H = M - \frac{i}{2}\mathit{\Gamma} \ , \tag{4}$$

with M and $\mathit{\Gamma}$ hermitian 2×2 matrices. The entries of these matrices can be expressed in terms of the complex parameters ϵ_S, ϵ_L, appearing in the eigenstates of H,

$$|K_S\rangle = N_S \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ \epsilon_S \end{pmatrix} \ , \quad |K_L\rangle = N_L \begin{pmatrix} \epsilon_L \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} \ , \tag{5}$$

and the four real parameters, m_S, γ_S and m_L, γ_L characterizing the eigenvalues of H:

$$\lambda_S = m_S - \frac{i}{2}\gamma_S \ , \quad \lambda_L = m_L - \frac{i}{2}\gamma_L \ , \tag{6}$$

where $N_S = (1 + |\epsilon_S|^2)^{-1/2}$ and $N_L = (1 + |\epsilon_L|^2)^{-1/2}$ are normalization factors. It proves convenient to use also the following positive combinations:

$$\Delta\Gamma = \gamma_S - \gamma_L \ , \qquad \Delta m = m_L - m_S \ , \tag{7}$$

corresponding to the differences between decay widths and masses of the states K_S and K_L, as well as of the complex quantities:

$$\Gamma_\pm = \Gamma \pm i\Delta m \ , \qquad \Delta\Gamma_\pm = \Delta\Gamma \pm 2i\Delta m \tag{8}$$

with $\Gamma = (\gamma_S + \gamma_L)/2$.

The explicit form of the piece $L[\rho]$ can be most simply given by expanding ρ in terms of Pauli matrices σ_i and the identity σ_0: $\rho = \rho_\mu\, \sigma_\mu$, $\mu =$ 0, 1, 2, 3. In this way, the map $L[\rho]$ can be represented by a symmetric 4×4 matrix $\big[L_{\mu\nu}\big]$, acting on the column vector with components $(\rho_0, \rho_1, \rho_2, \rho_3)$. It can be parametrized by the six real constants a, b, c, α, β, and γ: [7, 8]

$$\big[L_{\mu\nu}\big] = -2 \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & a & b & c \\ 0 & b & \alpha & \beta \\ 0 & c & \beta & \gamma \end{pmatrix} \ , \tag{9}$$

with a, α and γ non-negative. These parameters are not all independent; to assure the complete positivity of the map L, they have to satisfy the following inequalities:

$$\begin{aligned} &a \le \alpha + \gamma \ , \qquad && 4b^2 \le \gamma^2 - \big(a - \alpha\big)^2 \ , \\ &\alpha \le a + \gamma \ , && 4c^2 \le \alpha^2 - \big(a - \gamma\big)^2 \ , \\ &\gamma \le a + \alpha \ , && 4\beta^2 \le a^2 - \big(\alpha - \gamma\big)^2 \ . \end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

(Notice that from the above inequalities automatically follows that the map L is positive; indeed, complete positivity is a stronger request than simple positivity.)

In absence of the additional piece $L[\rho]$, the evolution equation (3) would transform pure states (*i.e.* states of the form $|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$) into pure states, in spite of the fact that probability is not conserved, since $\mathrm{Tr}\,[\rho(t)]] \leq \mathrm{Tr}\,[\rho(0)]$. However, this is due to the presence of a non-hermitian part in the effective hamiltonian H and not to a mixing-enhancing mechanism that makes $\rho(t)$ less ordered in time. Instead, loss of quantum coherence shows up when the extra piece $L[\rho]$ is also present: it produces dissipation and possible transitions from pure states to mixed states.

Equations of the general form (3), but with different L, have also been used to describe the time evolution of the K^0-$\overline{K^0}$ system. [10-14, 15] They are based on the general idea that the quantum fluctuations of the gravitational field at Planck's length produces loss of phase-coherence. [16, 17] In those discussions, among other more obvious requirements like conservation of probability and entropy increase, the linear map $L[\rho]$ is constrained to be simply positive and not completely positive.

In the case of the neutral kaons, complete positivity of the time evolution γ_t, transforming the initial density matrix $\rho(0)$ into $\rho(t)$, amounts to the positivity of the natural extension of γ_t to a linear transformation on the states of a larger system consisting of the kaon system and another finite-level system of arbitrary dimension. Simple positivity guarantees that the eigenvalues of any density matrix for the neutral kaon system remain positive. Complete positivity is a stronger property in the sense that the same holds for density matrices of the compound system.

Although at first sight the requirement of complete positivity of the evolution equation (3) instead of the much milder simple positivity seems a mere technical request, it has far-reaching consequences. In particular, when the additional finite-level system alluded above is taken to be another kaon system (a physical situation commonly encountered in the so-called ϕ-factories), the complete positivity of the time-evolution (3) assures the absence of unphysical effects, like the appearance of negative probabilities, that could occur for simple positive dynamics. [18]

In the following we shall compare the predictions of the completely positive dynamics (3), (9) with available experimental data on the neutral kaon system. In principle, this allows a complete determination of the values of the phenomenological parameters appearing in the matrix (9), and therefore a test on the condition of complete positivity, *i.e.* of the inequalities (10). In practice, the experimental data are not yet accurate enough to test the conditions (10); nevertheless, estimates on the three parameters c, β and γ will be obtained.

The first step is to solve the equation (3) for the density matrix ρ with arbitrary initial conditions. It is convenient to use perturbation theory, assuming a, b, c, α, β and γ to be small, of the same order of magnitude of $\epsilon_S\Delta\Gamma$ and $\epsilon_L\Delta\Gamma$. To first order in the small parameters, the time-dependence of the four components of the density matrix $\rho(t)$ are explicitly given by: [8]

$$\begin{aligned}\rho_1(t) =& e^{-\gamma_S t}\rho_1 + \frac{\gamma}{\Delta\Gamma}\left(e^{-\gamma_L t} - e^{-\gamma_S t}\right)\rho_2\\ &+\left(\epsilon_L^* - \frac{2C}{\Delta\Gamma_+}\right)\left(e^{-\Gamma_- t} - e^{-\gamma_S t}\right)\rho_3 + \left(\epsilon_L - \frac{2C^*}{\Delta\Gamma_-}\right)\left(e^{-\Gamma_+ t} - e^{-\gamma_S t}\right)\rho_4\ ,\end{aligned} \qquad (11a)$$

$$\rho_2(t) = e^{-\gamma_L t}\rho_2 + \frac{\gamma}{\Delta\Gamma}\left(e^{-\gamma_L t} - e^{-\gamma_S t}\right)\rho_1 + \left(\epsilon_S - \frac{2C}{\Delta\Gamma_-}\right)\left(e^{-\Gamma_- t} - e^{-\gamma_L t}\right)\rho_3 + \left(\epsilon_S^* - \frac{2C^*}{\Delta\Gamma_+}\right)\left(e^{-\Gamma_+ t} - e^{-\gamma_L t}\right)\rho_4 \;, \qquad (11b)$$

$$\rho_3(t) = e^{-(\Gamma_- + A - \gamma)t}\rho_3 - \frac{iB}{2\Delta m}\left(e^{-\Gamma_- t} - e^{-\Gamma_+ t}\right)\rho_4 - \left(\epsilon_S^* + \frac{2C^*}{\Delta\Gamma_+}\right)\left(e^{-\Gamma_- t} - e^{-\gamma_S t}\right)\rho_1 - \left(\epsilon_L + \frac{2C^*}{\Delta\Gamma_-}\right)\left(e^{-\Gamma_- t} - e^{-\gamma_L t}\right)\rho_2 \;, \qquad (11c)$$

$$\rho_4(t) = e^{-(\Gamma_+ + A - \gamma)t}\rho_4 + \frac{iB^*}{2\Delta m}\left(e^{-\Gamma_+ t} - e^{-\Gamma_- t}\right)\rho_3 - \left(\epsilon_S + \frac{2C}{\Delta\Gamma_-}\right)\left(e^{-\Gamma_+ t} - e^{-\gamma_S t}\right)\rho_1 - \left(\epsilon_L^* + \frac{2C}{\Delta\Gamma_+}\right)\left(e^{-\Gamma_+ t} - e^{-\gamma_L t}\right)\rho_2 \;, \qquad (11d)$$

where ρ_1, ρ_2, ρ_3 and $\rho_4 \equiv \rho_3^*$ are the initial values at $t = 0$, and the following convenient notations have been used:

$$A = \alpha + a \;, \quad B = \alpha - a + 2ib \;, \quad C = c + i\beta \;. \qquad (12)$$

Furthermore, from (3) and (9) one can extract the contributions ρ_L and ρ_S that correspond to the K_L and K_S neutral kaons:

$$\rho_L = \begin{pmatrix} \left|\epsilon_L + \frac{2C^*}{\Delta\Gamma_-}\right|^2 + \frac{\gamma}{\Delta\Gamma} - 8\left|\frac{C}{\Delta\Gamma_+}\right|^2 - 4\,\mathcal{R}e\left(\frac{\epsilon_L C}{\Delta\Gamma}\right) & \epsilon_L + \frac{2C^*}{\Delta\Gamma_-} \\ \epsilon_L^* + \frac{2C}{\Delta\Gamma_+} & 1 \end{pmatrix} \;, \qquad (13a)$$

and

$$\rho_S = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \epsilon_S^* + \frac{2C^*}{\Delta\Gamma_+} \\ \epsilon_S + \frac{2C}{\Delta\Gamma_-} & \left|\epsilon_S + \frac{2C}{\Delta\Gamma_-}\right|^2 - \frac{\gamma}{\Delta\Gamma} - 8\left|\frac{C}{\Delta\Gamma_+}\right|^2 - 4\,\mathcal{R}e\left(\frac{\epsilon_S C^*}{\Delta\Gamma}\right) \end{pmatrix} \;. \qquad (13b)$$

In these expressions we have kept only the leading contributions in each entry of the two matrices; this approximation will suffice for the subsequent discussions.

The solutions (11) and (13) can now be used to compute certain observables for the $K^0 - \overline{K^0}$ system; indeed, any physical property of the neutral kaons can be extracted from the density matrix $\rho(t)$ by taking its trace with suitable hermitian operators.

Useful observables are associated with the decays of the neutral kaons into pion states, or into semileptonic states $\pi\ell\nu$. The amplitudes for the decay of a K^0 state into $\pi^+\pi^-$ and $\pi^0\pi^0$ final states are usually parametrized as follows, in terms of the s-wave phase-shifts δ_i and the complex coefficients A_i, B_i, $i = 1,\ 2$: [19]

$$\mathcal{A}(K^0 \to \pi^+\pi^-) = (A_0 + B_0)\,e^{i\delta_0} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\,(A_2 + B_2)\,e^{i\delta_2} \;, \qquad (14a)$$

$$\mathcal{A}(K^0 \to \pi^0\pi^0) = (A_0 + B_0)\,e^{i\delta_0} - \sqrt{2}\,(A_2 + B_2)\,e^{i\delta_2} \;, \qquad (14b)$$

where the indices 0, 2 refers to the total isospin. The amplitudes for the $\overline{K^0}$ decays are obtained from these with the substitutions: $A_i \to A_i^*$ and $B_i \to -B_i^*$. The imaginary parts of A_i signals direct CP-violation, while a non zero value for B_i will also break CPT invariance.

To construct the operators that describe these two pion decays in the formalism of density matrices, one has to pass to the K_1, K_2 basis of Eq.(1). It is convenient to label the corresponding decay amplitudes as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathcal{A}(K_1 \to \pi^+\pi^-) = X_{+-}\ , \qquad && \mathcal{A}(K_2 \to \pi^+\pi^-) = Y_{+-}\ \mathcal{A}(K_1 \to \pi^+\pi^-)\ , \\ &\mathcal{A}(K_1 \to \pi^0\pi^0) = X_{00}\ , && \mathcal{A}(K_2 \to \pi^0\pi^0) = Y_{00}\ \mathcal{A}(K_1 \to \pi^0\pi^0)\ . \end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

The complex parameters X and Y can be easily expressed in terms of A_i, B_i and δ_i of (14). Taking the phase convention for which A_0 is real, up to first order in the CP and CPT violating parameters, one explicitly finds:

$$X_{+-} = \sqrt{2}\left[A_0 + i\mathcal{I}m(B_0)\right] e^{i\delta_0} + \left[\mathcal{R}e(A_2) + i\mathcal{I}m(B_2)\right] e^{i\delta_2}\ , \tag{16a}$$

$$X_{00} = \sqrt{2}\left[A_0 + i\mathcal{I}m(B_0)\right] e^{i\delta_0} - 2\left[\mathcal{R}e(A_2) + i\mathcal{I}m(B_2)\right] e^{i\delta_2}\ , \tag{16a}$$

while

$$Y_{+-} = \frac{\mathcal{R}e(B_0)}{A_0} + \epsilon'\ , \qquad Y_{00} = \frac{\mathcal{R}e(B_0)}{A_0} - 2\epsilon'\ , \tag{17}$$

where

$$\epsilon' = \frac{e^{i(\delta_2-\delta_0)}}{\sqrt{2}}\,\frac{\mathcal{R}e(A_2)}{A_0}\left[i\frac{\mathcal{I}m(A_2)}{\mathcal{R}e(A_2)} + \frac{\mathcal{R}e(B_2)}{\mathcal{R}e(A_2)} - \frac{\mathcal{R}e(B_0)}{A_0}\right]\ , \tag{18}$$

is the parameter that uniquely signals CP and CPT violation in the transition amplitudes.

Using (15), the operators that describe the $\pi^+\pi^-$ and $\pi^0\pi^0$ final states and include direct CP and CPT violations are readily found: [15]

$$\mathcal{O}_{+-} = |X_{+-}|^2 \begin{bmatrix} 1 & Y_{+-} \\ Y_{+-}^* & |Y_{+-}|^2 \end{bmatrix}\ , \qquad \mathcal{O}_{00} = |X_{00}|^2 \begin{bmatrix} 1 & Y_{00} \\ Y_{00}^* & |Y_{00}|^2 \end{bmatrix}\ . \tag{19}$$

With the help of these matrices, one can now compute the time-dependent decay rate of a neutral kaon into two pions. In the case of charged pions, for a generic initial state, one has:

$$R_{+-}(t) = \frac{\mathrm{Tr}\left[\rho(t)\mathcal{O}_{+-}\right]}{\mathrm{Tr}\left[\rho(0)\mathcal{O}_{+-}\right]}\ . \tag{20}$$

For a state which is initially a pure K^0, the corresponding density matrix evolves in time according to (3), with the initial condition

$$\rho(0) = \rho_{K^0} = |K^0\rangle\langle K^0| \equiv \frac{1}{2}\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}\ . \tag{21}$$

In this case, the observable (20) takes the general form:

$$R_{+-}(t) = e^{-\gamma_S t} + R^L_{+-}\ e^{-\gamma_L t} + 2\,e^{-\Gamma t}\,|\eta_{+-}|\cos(\Delta m\, t - \phi_{+-})\ . \tag{22}$$

The two-pion decay rate for the K_L state can be obtained using $(13a)$:

$$R^L_{+-} = \left| \epsilon_L + \frac{2C^*}{\Delta\Gamma_-} + Y_{+-} \right|^2 + \frac{\gamma}{\Delta\Gamma} - 8 \left| \frac{C}{\Delta\Gamma_+} \right|^2 - 4\,\mathcal{R}e\left(\frac{\epsilon_L C}{\Delta\Gamma} \right) \ , \tag{23}$$

while the interference term is determined by the combination

$$\epsilon_L - \frac{2C^*}{\Delta\Gamma_-} + Y_{+-} \equiv \eta_{+-} = |\eta_{+-}|\, e^{i\phi_{+-}} \ . \tag{24}$$

Similar formulas hold for the decay of a K^0 into neutral pions: one just needs to substitute the index $+-$ with 00.

Notice that in the standard quantum mechanical case, the K_L two-pion decay rate R^L_{+-} is quadratic in the parameters ϵ_L and Y_{+-}. To get a consistent expression when also the term $L[\rho]$ in (3) is present, it is necessary to take into account terms up to second order in all small quantities, as in (23). This is the only case among the discussed observables for which second order terms are needed.

The expressions (23) and (24) can be directly compared with the experimental data. However, some care needs to be used in the choice of the proper measured results. In fact, in fitting their data on the two pion decay, the various experimental groups use the standard quantum mechanical formula for $R_{+-}(t)$, obtained from (22) by setting $R^L_{+-} = |\eta_{+-}|^2$. However, as discussed in [15], different experimental setups measured the time dependence of $R_{+-}(t)$ focusing either into the interference region or the long-time tail of the decay distribution. In particular, due to a flux normalization, the results of the CERN-Heidelberg Collaboration [20] are insensitive to the interference effects; therefore their data can be regarded as a determination of R^L_{+-}: $R^L_{+-} = (5.29 \pm 0.16) \times 10^{-6}$. On the other hand, the attention of the CPLEAR Collaboration [21] is concentrated on the interference region, so that their results can be taken to determine both the modulus $|\eta_{+-}|$ and the phase ϕ_{+-} of η_{+-}. Their most recent preliminary values for these two quantities read [22]: $|\eta_{+-}| = (2.316 \pm 0.039) \times 10^{-3}$, $\phi_{+-} = (43.5 \pm 0.8)^\circ$.

Other interesting observables, directly measured in experiments, are the asymmetries associated with the decay into the final state f of an initial K^0 as compared to the corresponding decay into $\bar{f}$ of an initial $\overline{K^0}$. Using the same notations as before, all these asymmetries have the general form

$$A(t) = \frac{\mathrm{Tr}\Big[\rho_{\bar{K}^0}(t)\mathcal{O}_{\bar{f}}\Big] - \Big[\rho_{K^0}(t)\mathcal{O}_f\Big]}{\mathrm{Tr}\Big[\rho_{\bar{K}^0}(t)\mathcal{O}_{\bar{f}}\Big] + \Big[\rho_{K^0}(t)\mathcal{O}_f\Big]} \ , \tag{25}$$

where $\rho_{\bar{K}^0}(t)$ and $\rho_{K^0}(t)$ are the solutions of (3) with the initial conditions of having a pure $\overline{K^0}$ and pure K^0 at $t = 0$, respectively. These correspond to the initial density matrices:

$$\rho_{\bar{K}^0} = |\overline{K^0}\rangle\langle\overline{K^0}| \equiv \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -1 \\ -1 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \ , \tag{26}$$

and (21) above.

One of the simplest asymmetries that can be computed is the one that involves $\pi^+\pi^-\pi^0$ in the final state. The operator $\mathcal{O}_{+-0}$ responsible for this decay can be obtained following steps similar to the ones that led to the expressions of $\mathcal{O}_{+-}$ and $\mathcal{O}_{00}$ above. Parameterizing the decay amplitudes as:

$$\mathcal{A}(K_2 \to \pi^+\pi^-\pi^0) = X_{+-0}\ , \qquad \mathcal{A}(K_1 \to \pi^+\pi^-\pi^0) = Y_{+-0}\ \mathcal{A}(K_2 \to \pi^+\pi^-\pi^0)\ , \tag{27}$$

one easily finds: [15]

$$\mathcal{O}_{+-0} = |X_{+-0}|^2 \begin{bmatrix} |Y_{+-0}|^2 & Y^*_{+-0} \\ Y_{+-0} & 1 \end{bmatrix}\ . \tag{28}$$

Inserting this in (25) and using the solutions (11), one obtains, to first order in the small quantities, the following expression for the asymmetry integrated over the entire Dalitz plot:

$$\begin{aligned} A_{+-0}(t) =& 2\,\mathcal{R}e\left(\epsilon_S - \frac{2C}{\Delta\Gamma_-}\right) \\ & -2\,e^{-\Delta\Gamma t/2}\Big[\mathcal{R}e(\eta_{+-0})\,\cos(\Delta m\,t) - \mathcal{I}m(\eta_{+-0})\,\sin(\Delta m\,t)\Big]\ , \end{aligned} \tag{29}$$

where

$$\eta_{+-0} \equiv \epsilon_S - \frac{2C}{\Delta\Gamma_-} + Y_{+-0}\ . \tag{30}$$

It is precisely the real and imaginary part of this parameter, appearing in the interference term of $A_{+-0}(t)$, that is usually fitted with the experimental data. The best available determination of η_{+-0} comes from the CPLEAR Collaboration [22]. In particular, one finds: $\mathcal{R}e(\eta_{+-0}) = (-4 \pm 8) \times 10^{-3}$. (The value of $\mathcal{I}m(\eta_{+-0})$ will not be needed for the considerations that follow.)

Other interesting asymmetries involve decays into semileptonic states. The amplitudes for the decay of a K^0 or a $\overline{K^0}$ state into $\pi^-\ell^+\nu$ and $\pi^+\ell^-\bar\nu$ are usually parametrized by three complex constants x, y and z as follows:[23]

$$\mathcal{A}(K^0 \to \pi^-\ell^+\nu) = \mathcal{M}(1-y)\ , \tag{31a}$$

$$\mathcal{A}(\overline{K^0} \to \pi^+\ell^-\bar\nu) = \mathcal{M}^*(1+y^*)\ , \tag{31b}$$

$$\mathcal{A}(K^0 \to \pi^+\ell^-\bar\nu) = z\,\mathcal{A}(\overline{K^0} \to \pi^+\ell^-\bar\nu)\ , \tag{31c}$$

$$\mathcal{A}(\overline{K^0} \to \pi^-\ell^+\nu) = x\,\mathcal{A}(K^0 \to \pi^-\ell^+\nu)\ , \tag{31d}$$

where $\mathcal{M}$ is a common factor. (In Ref.[23] $\bar x \equiv z^*$ is used instead of z.) The $\Delta S = \Delta Q$ rule would forbid the decays $K^0 \to \pi^+\ell^-\bar\nu$ and $\overline{K^0} \to \pi^-\ell^+\nu$, so that the parameters x and z measure the violations of this rule. Instead, CPT-invariance would require $y = 0$.

From the parametrization in (31), one can deduce the decay amplitudes from the states (1) of definite CP, and therefore the following expressions for the two operators describing the semileptonic decays:

$$\mathcal{O}_{\ell^+} = \frac{|\mathcal{M}|^2}{2}\,|1-y|^2 \begin{bmatrix} |1+x|^2 & (1+x^*)(1-x) \\ (1+x)(1-x^*) & |1-x|^2 \end{bmatrix}\ , \tag{32a}$$

$$\mathcal{O}_{\ell^-} = \frac{|\mathcal{M}|^2}{2}\,|1+y|^2 \begin{bmatrix} |z+1|^2 & (z^*+1)(z-1) \\ (z+1)(z^*-1) & |z-1|^2 \end{bmatrix}\ . \tag{32b}$$

The parameters x, y, and z are expected to be very small, and the available experimental determinations support this theoretical hypothesis. Therefore, in the following we shall treat these constants as the other small parameters in the theory and compute the various semileptonic observables keeping only the first order terms in all these parameters.

With the help of (32), one can compute the following two semileptonic asymmetries, for which experimental data are available:

$$A_{\Delta m}(t) = \frac{\mathrm{Tr}\Big[\rho_{\bar{K}^0}(t)\Big(\mathcal{O}_{\ell^-} - \mathcal{O}_{\ell^+}\Big)\Big] - \mathrm{Tr}\Big[\rho_{K^0}(t)\Big(\mathcal{O}_{\ell^-} - \mathcal{O}_{\ell^+}\Big)\Big]}{\mathrm{Tr}\Big[\rho_{\bar{K}^0}(t)\Big(\mathcal{O}_{\ell^-} + \mathcal{O}_{\ell^+}\Big)\Big] + \mathrm{Tr}\Big[\rho_{K^0}(t)\Big(\mathcal{O}_{\ell^-} + \mathcal{O}_{\ell^+}\Big)\Big]} \tag{33a}$$

$$A_{\ell}(t) = \frac{\mathrm{Tr}\Big[\rho_{\bar{K}^0}(t)\Big(\mathcal{O}_{\ell^-} + \mathcal{O}_{\ell^+}\Big)\Big] - \mathrm{Tr}\Big[\rho_{K^0}(t)\Big(\mathcal{O}_{\ell^-} + \mathcal{O}_{\ell^+}\Big)\Big]}{\mathrm{Tr}\Big[\rho_{\bar{K}^0}(t)\Big(\mathcal{O}_{\ell^-} + \mathcal{O}_{\ell^+}\Big)\Big] + \mathrm{Tr}\Big[\rho_{K^0}(t)\Big(\mathcal{O}_{\ell^-} + \mathcal{O}_{\ell^+}\Big)\Big]}\ . \tag{33b}$$

The first observable is sensible to the $K^0 \leftrightarrow \overline{K^0}$ oscillation frequency, while the second one (also called $A_2(t)$) is the decay rate asymmetry between $\overline{K^0}$ and K^0 in any semileptonic final state. Using the solutions (11) of the kaon evolution equation, one finds the following explicit expressions, valid to first order in all small parameters:

$$A_{\Delta m}(t) = \frac{N_{\Delta m}(t)}{D(t)}\ , \qquad A_{\ell}(t) = \frac{N_{\ell}(t)}{D(t)}\ , \tag{34}$$

where the numerators are given by

$$\begin{aligned} N_{\Delta m}(t) = 2\, e^{-\Gamma t}\bigg\{ & [1-(A-\gamma)t]\, \cos(\Delta m\, t) \\ & + \bigg[\mathcal{R}e\left(\frac{B}{\Delta m}\right) - \mathcal{I}m(x+z)\bigg]\, \sin(\Delta m\, t)\bigg\}\ , \end{aligned} \tag{35a}$$

$$\begin{aligned} N_{\ell}(t) = {} & 2\, \mathcal{R}e\left(\epsilon_L - \frac{2C^*}{\Delta\Gamma_-}\right)\, e^{-\gamma_S t} + 2\, \mathcal{R}e\left(\epsilon_S - \frac{2C}{\Delta\Gamma_-}\right)\, e^{-\gamma_L t} \\ & - 2\, e^{-\Gamma t}\bigg\{\bigg[\mathcal{R}e\left(\epsilon_L - \frac{2C^*}{\Delta\Gamma_-}\right) + \mathcal{R}e\left(\epsilon_S - \frac{2C}{\Delta\Gamma_-}\right)\bigg]\, \cos(\Delta m\, t) \\ & + \bigg[\mathcal{I}m\left(\epsilon_L - \frac{2C^*}{\Delta\Gamma_-}\right) - \mathcal{I}m\left(\epsilon_S - \frac{2C}{\Delta\Gamma_-}\right) - \mathcal{I}m(x-z)\bigg]\, \sin(\Delta m\, t)\bigg\}\ , \end{aligned} \tag{35b}$$

while the common denominator reads

$$D(t) = \bigg[1 - \frac{2\gamma}{\Delta\Gamma} + \mathcal{R}e(x+z)\bigg]\, e^{-\gamma_S t} + \bigg[1 + \frac{2\gamma}{\Delta\Gamma} - \mathcal{R}e(x+z)\bigg]\, e^{-\gamma_L t}\ . \tag{35c}$$

(Notice that the expression in (35a) is valid only for "small" times, *i.e.* as long as $e^{-(A-\gamma)t} \sim 1-(A-\gamma)t$.)

The asymmetry $A_{\Delta m}(t)$ can be used to determine the parameters a and α, via the combinations $A = \alpha + a$ and $\mathcal{R}e(B) = \alpha - a$, once the $\Delta S = \Delta Q$ rule is assumed and γ has been fixed using other observables. On the contrary, notice that, within our approximation, the long-time limit of $A_\ell(t)/2$ gives the constant $2\,\mathcal{R}e(\epsilon_S - 2C/\Delta\Gamma_-)$, which is independent from x, y and z. Therefore, this asymmetry allows a determination of this combination, independently from the $\Delta S = \Delta Q$ rule, and in alternative to A_{+-0}, see (29).

Another useful observable involving semileptonic decays is the so called CP violating charge asymmetry:

$$\delta(t) = \frac{\mathrm{Tr}\Big[\rho(t)\,(\mathcal{O}_{\ell^+} - \mathcal{O}_{\ell^-})\Big]}{\mathrm{Tr}\Big[\rho(t)\,(\mathcal{O}_{\ell^+} + \mathcal{O}_{\ell^-})\Big]}\ . \tag{36}$$

For a state which is initially a pure K^0, it can be explicitly written as:

$$\delta(t) = \frac{\delta_S\, e^{-\gamma_S t} + \delta_L\, e^{-\gamma_L t} + 2\, e^{-\Gamma t}\cos(\Delta m\, t)}{e^{-\gamma_S t} + e^{-\gamma_L t}}\ , \tag{37}$$

where

$$\delta_S = 2\,\mathcal{R}e\left(\epsilon_S + \frac{2C}{\Delta\Gamma_-}\right) - \mathcal{R}e(2y + z - x)\ , \tag{38a}$$

$$\delta_L = 2\,\mathcal{R}e\left(\epsilon_L + \frac{2C^*}{\Delta\Gamma_-}\right) - \mathcal{R}e(2y + x - z)\ , \tag{38b}$$

are the charge asymmetries for the K_S and K_L states, respectively. For sake of simplicity, in the expression (37) we have kept only the dominant pieces in each term. Furthermore, notice that the two expressions (38) can also be obtained by using directly the expressions (13) for ρ_S and ρ_L.

Although not immediately connected with violations of a specific discrete symmetry, by comparing the time-dependent asymmetry $\delta(t)$ with the experimental data one can in principle measure at the same time the charge asymmetries for both the K_S and K_L. Unfortunately, the above expression for $\delta(t)$ has not yet been fitted with the experimental data, so that one needs to look for separate determinations of δ_S and δ_L. This last quantity is very well known from the fixed target experiments, and for its value one can take the world average given in [24]: $\delta_L = (3.27 \pm 0.12) \times 10^{-3}$

On the contrary, no direct measurement of δ_S has been performed yet: the available estimates on this quantity are deduced from other observables, *e.g.* the two semileptonic asymmetries A_T and A_{CPT} obtained from the general formula (25) when the final state f is $\pi^+\ell^-\bar{\nu}$ and $\pi^-\ell^+\nu$, respectively. The CPLEAR Collaboration has recently reported a value for the combination $(A_T + A_{CPT})/2$, which in ordinary quantum mechanics would give precisely an estimate for δ_S [22]. Although this is no longer strictly true when the generalized evolution equation (3) is used to describe the decay of the neutral kaon system (see [8]), in lacking of more complete and precise results we shall take the CPLEAR value for $(A_T + A_{CPT})/2$ as an experimental determination of the K_S charge asymmetry: $\delta_S = (3.2 \pm 1.8) \times 10^{-3}$.

We are now ready to derive estimates on some of the parameters appearing in the dissipative piece $L[\rho]$ of the evolution equation (3). In this analysis, we shall adopt some simplifying working assumptions. First, we shall ignore the effects of ϵ' in the two-pion decay rate (22), since one expects: $\epsilon'/\epsilon_L \sim 10^{-4}$. Thus, the formulas presented for the charged pion decay apply equally well to the neutron pion decay. Also, we shall concentrate on possible CPT violations in the time evolution of the neutral kaon system as given by the dissipative part (9) and therefore ignore the CPT non preserving contributions in the various decay amplitudes; this amounts to set the parameters y and B_0, hence Y_{+-}, to zero. Furthermore, we shall assume the validity of the $\Delta S = \Delta Q$ rule in the semileptonic decays; this choice is supported by theoretical arguments that predict the parameters x and z to be neglegibly small.[19]

From the two and three-pion observables (24), (30) and the two semileptonic charge asymmetries (38), one has:

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathcal{R}e\left(\epsilon_S + \frac{2C}{\Delta\Gamma_-}\right) = \frac{\delta_S}{2}\ , \qquad &&\mathcal{R}e\left(\epsilon_L + \frac{2C}{\Delta\Gamma_+}\right) = \frac{\delta_L}{2}\ , \\ &\mathcal{R}e\left(\epsilon_S - \frac{2C}{\Delta\Gamma_-}\right) = \mathcal{R}e(\eta_{+-0})\ , \qquad &&\mathcal{R}e\left(\epsilon_L - \frac{2C}{\Delta\Gamma_+}\right) = |\eta_{+-}|\ \cos(\phi_{+-})\ . \end{aligned} \tag{39}$$

These relations allow extracting $\mathcal{R}e(\epsilon_S)$, $\mathcal{R}e(\epsilon_L)$ and

$$\frac{c}{\Delta\Gamma} = \frac{1+\tau^2}{16}\left[\delta_S + \delta_L - 2\,\eta_{+-}\ \cos(\phi_{+-}) - 2\,\mathcal{R}e(\eta_{+-0})\right]\ , \tag{40a}$$

$$\frac{\beta}{\Delta\Gamma} = \frac{1+\tau^2}{16\tau}\left[\delta_L - \delta_S - 2\,\eta_{+-}\ \cos(\phi_{+-}) + 2\,\mathcal{R}e(\eta_{+-0})\right]\ , \tag{40b}$$

where $\tau = 2\Delta m/\Delta\Gamma$ is the tangent of the so called superweak angle. From the previously quoted experimental values of the quantities on the r.h.s. of (38), and taking into account that τ is very well known, [24] $\tau = 0.9502 \pm 0.0034$, one obtains:

$$c = (1.0 \pm 1.4) \times 10^{-17}\ \text{GeV}\ , \qquad \beta = (-1.0 \pm 1.5) \times 10^{-17}\ \text{GeV}\ . \tag{41}$$

From these results, one can now estimate the value of the parameter γ, using (23) and the determination of the K_L two-pion decay rate from the CERN-Heidelberg Collaboration:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\gamma}{\Delta\Gamma} = R^L_{+-} - |\eta_{+-}|^2 + \frac{8}{1+\tau^2}\frac{\left(c^2+\beta^2\right)}{\Delta\Gamma^2} \\ + \frac{4}{(1+\tau^2)\Delta\Gamma}\left[\mathcal{R}e(\epsilon_L)\left((\tau^2-1)c - 2\tau\beta\right) - \mathcal{I}m(\epsilon_L)\left((\tau^2-1)\beta + 2\tau c\right)\right]\ ; \end{aligned} \tag{42}$$

$\mathcal{I}m(\epsilon_L)$ can be obtained by taking the imaginary part of (24): $\mathcal{I}m(\epsilon_L) = |\eta_{+-}|\ \sin(\phi_{+-}) + 2(\tau c - \beta)/[(1+\tau^2)\Delta\Gamma]$. In this way, one gets:

$$\gamma = (0.1 \pm 30.2) \times 10^{-20}\ \text{GeV}\ . \tag{43}$$

Unfortunately, the errors propagation produces in this case a large uncertainty.

Estimates for the parameters a and α can be obtained fitting the asymmetry ($33a$) with the available experimental data. Assuming again $x = y = z = 0$, taking γ as in (43) and for Δm the average of [24], we have performed a preliminary χ^2 fit of $A_{\Delta m}$ with the experimental data of the CPLEAR Collaboration published in [25]. The result, rather independent from the actual value of γ, gives: $a = (2.3 \pm 2.9) \times 10^{-17}$ GeV and $\alpha = (2.1 \pm 2.9) \times 10^{-17}$ GeV. These values should be taken as indicative; a more accurate fit along the lines discussed in [14] should provide more precise determinations.

The conclusion that can be drawn from this analysis is that the precision of the present experimental data on the neutral kaon system is not high enough to allow a meaningful test of the inequalities (10) and therefore of the hypothesis of complete positivity. Nevertheless, as soon as more complete and precise data become available, it will be possible to distinguish between simply positive and completely positive time-evolution maps in an actual experimental setup.

In this respect, particularly promising are the planned experiments on correlated neutral kaons at ϕ-factories. In fact, entangled kaon states might develop negative probabilities under simply positive time evolutions. Since this is forbidden by complete positivity, very different behaviours for entangled kaons are predicted in the two cases, with effects that might be experimentally detectable [26]. In view of the wide use of dynamical semigroups in the description of open systems [1, 2], these checks of complete positivity might have consequences that go beyond the specific situation of the neutral kaons.

REFERENCES

1. R. Alicki and K. Lendi, *Quantum Dynamical Semigroups and Applications*, Lect. Notes Phys. **286**, (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1987)
2. H. Spohn, Rev. Mod. Phys. **53** (1980) 569
3. V. Gorini, A. Kossakowski and E.C.G. Sudarshan, J. Math. Phys. **17** (1976) 821
4. G. Lindblad, Comm. Math. Phys. **48** (1976) 119
5. E.B. Davies, *Quantum Theory of Open Systems*, (Academic Press, New York, 1976)
6. V. Gorini, A. Frigerio, M. Verri, A. Kossakowski and E.C.G. Surdarshan, Rep. Math. Phys. **13** (1978) 149
7. F. Benatti and R. Floreanini, Phys. Lett. **B389** (1996) 100
8. F. Benatti and R. Floreanini, Completely positive dynamical maps and the neutral kaon system, Nucl. Phys. B, to appear
9. T.D. Lee and C.S. Wu, Ann. Rev. Nucl. Sci. **16** (1966) 511
10. J. Ellis, J.S. Hagelin, D.V. Nanopoulos and M. Srednicki, Nucl Phys. **B241** (1984) 381
11. J. Ellis, N.E. Mavromatos and D.V. Nanopoulos, Phys. Lett. **B293** (1992) 142
12. J. Ellis, N.E. Mavromatos and D.V. Nanopoulos, Int. J. Mod. Phys. **A11** (1996) 1489
13. J. Ellis, J.L. Lopez, N.E. Mavromatos and D.V. Nanopoulos, Phys. Rev. D **53** (1996) 3846
14. CPLEAR Collaboration, J. Ellis, N.E. Mavromatos and D.V. Nanopoulos, Phys. Lett. **B364** (1995) 239
15. P. Huet and M.E. Peskin, Nucl. Phys. **B434** (1995) 3
16. S. Hawking, Comm. Math. Phys. **87** (1983) 395
17. M. Srednicki, Nucl. Phys. **B410** (1993) 143
18. F. Benatti and R. Floreanini, Testing complete positivity, Trieste-preprint, 1996
19. L. Maiani, CP and CPT violation in neutral kaon decays, in *The Second Daϕne Physics Handbook*, L. Maiani, G. Pancheri and N. Paver, eds., (INFN, Frascati, 1995)
20. C. Geweniger *et al.*, Phys. Lett. **B48** (1974) 487
21. R. Adler *et al.*, Phys. Lett. **B286** (1992) 180
22. R. Adler *et al.*, Contribution of CPLEAR to the physics of the neutral kaon system, CERN-PPE/96-189, 1996
23. N.W. Tanner and R.H. Dalitz, Ann. of Phys. **171** (1986) 463
24. Particle Data Group, Phys. Rev. D **54** (1996) 1
25. R. Adler *et al.*, Phys. Lett. **B363** (1995) 237
26. F. Benatti and R. Floreanini, in preparation